

that they would be efficacious in relieving minor discomforts associated with menstruation; whereas they would not be efficacious for such purpose: (Gold Medal Compound Pills) "Directions. One pill before meals and at bedtime. Begin a day or two before expected period or when functional discomfort appears. At bedtime, a brief hot foot bath up to the knees or hot sitz bath is suggested to help improve local circulation, if needed. Drink a pint or less of hot ginger tea a few days before regular time. Keep feet and body warm and bowels open. * * * Intended only for palliative relief in minor discomforts, not as a remedy for diseases and underlying causes which might affect functional menstruation"; (Savatan) "Directions. Take one Savatan four times a day, before meals and at bedtime. It may be desirable to take a brief hot foot bath up to the knees or hot sitz bath to improve pelvic circulation. A few days before expected period or when functional discomfort appears, drink freely a pint if possible of hot ginger tea and keep the body warm. * * * Savatan is intended only for palliative relief and not as a remedy for diseases and underlying causes which might affect functional menstruation."

On April 22, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

737. Misbranding of Green's Reliable Restorer. U. S. v. 8¼ Dozen Bottles of Green's Reliable Restorer. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 7434. Sample No. 80742-E.)

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading claims that it would restore gray hair to its natural color and would be efficacious in the treatment of certain scalp conditions.

On May 2, 1942, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky filed a libel against the above-named product at Grayson, Ky., alleging that it had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 16, 1942, by A. J. Green from Clarksburg, W. Va.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of lead acetate, lead sulfate, sulfur, zinc acetate, alcohol, glycerin, oil of bay, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements in the labeling, "Contents: Sulphur, Zinc Sulfate, Acetate Merck, Glycerine, Bay Rum, Water Reliable Restorer * * * This preparation restores grey or faded hair to its natural color Frees the scalp from Dandruff and All Contagious Eruptions Stops hair from falling, promotes its growth * * * To Restore Growth—Apply the 'Restorer' daily and brush the scalp vigorously with a stiff brush," were false and misleading, since it contained no zinc sulfate but did contain lead salts which were not declared, and it would not restore the natural color to gray or faded hair, would not free the scalp from dandruff and all contagious eruptions, and would not restore the growth of hair or prevent it from falling. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the label failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents.

On May 25, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

738. Misbranding of O'Dara. U. S. v. 142 3-Fluid-Ounce Bottles of O'Dara. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6186. Sample No. 73339-E.)

This product was not antiseptic when used in the dilutions recommended in the labeling, and the labeling also bore false and misleading therapeutic claims.

On January 6, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of Nebraska filed a libel against the above-named product at Omaha, Nebr., alleging that it had been shipped in interstate commerce from St. Louis, Mo., by O'Dara Products Co. on or about April 28, 1941; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of alcohol (46 percent), glycerin (17 percent), potassium iodide (5 percent), methyl salicylate (7 percent), zinc chloride (3 percent), phenol (1 percent), water, and small proportions of saccharin and myrrh. Bacteriological examination showed that it would not be antiseptic when used in the dilution of 1 teaspoonful to a glass of water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that statements in the labeling which represented that it constituted a proper or adequate treatment for pyorrhea, trench mouth, canker sores, stomatitis, or spongy gums; that it would coagulate, detach, and clear away objectionable matter, leave the tissues clean and have a healing effect or stimulate healing processes; that it would kill disease-producing organisms embedded in the tissues to which it was applied; that it was an